



REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In a prior paper, Applicant has amended claim 6, cancelled claims 1-5 and 12-20 without prejudice and added new claims 21-25. Applicant understands that the amendments were objected to due to informalities in the amendment of claim 6. Specifically, the Office Action of November 2, 2010 states:

These instances are at least as follows (note: line numbers refer to the lines in the 10/18/2010 claims):

- Claim 6, line 11: the semicolon ";" (which appeared in the immediate prior version of the claims) following the word "back" appears to have been deleted, but there are no markings to indicate such a change.
- Claim 6, lines 25-26: the limitation of "a gating electrode mounted on the housing, a focus electrode mounted on the housing." (which appeared in the immediate prior version of the claims) is missing, but no markings indicate that a change has been made. Therefore, it is unclear as to whether or not the limitation was meant to be deleted.
- Claim 6, line 31: the limitation of ", the detection electrode to detect electrons reflected from a recording medium" (which appeared in the immediate prior version of the claims) is missing, but no markings indicate that a change has been made. Therefore, it is unclear as to whether or not the limitation was meant to be deleted.

Applicant has reviewed the relevant claim language.

Regarding the semicolon of line 11, this semicolon was split apart from the word "back" and appears at the end of the amended clause, after the inserted language, thus no change occurred. Regarding the "gating electrode" and "focus electrode" clauses, these clauses have been reinserted in the version of claim 6 contained herein. Regarding the language relating to the detection electrode, that language has also been reinserted in the version of claim 6 contained herein. Applicant submits that these omissions occurred through error and without deceptive intent. Applicant requests reconsideration of the application as amended.

Applicant submits that the claim as amended are in condition for allowance, and requests such allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant(s) believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

TIPS GROUP

Date: March 2, 2011


Glenn E. Von Tersch
Registration No. 41,364

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 45965
Technical & Intellectual Property Strategy Group
Telephone: 650-293-3352